

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/935,579	08/24/2001	Luca Chiarabini	60004720-3	5207
7590	02/08/2006		EXAMINER	
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY Intellectual Property Administration P. O. Box 272400 Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400			POON, KING Y	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2624	

DATE MAILED: 02/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/935,579	CHIARABINI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	King Y. Poon	2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 November 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 24-39 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 24-28 and 30-38 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 29 and 39 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/9/2005 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

3. Claims 24-26, 29, 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by admitted prior art page 2, lines 18-27, applicant's disclosure.

Regarding claims 24-26, 29, 32-34: Please see page 2, lines 18-27, page 1, lines 19-24, applicant's disclosure.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 24-27, 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okimoto et al (US 6,426,799) in view of Saito (US 6,982,801) and Maeda (US 6,775,705).

Regarding claims 24: Okimoto teaches a computer-implemented (column 4, lines 65-67) method comprising: on a first thread, (task of PC, column 4, lines 65-67) downloading first and second pieces of data for first and second images (e.g., the pages of column 10, lines 40-45, fig. 20, of email received, column 14, lines 30-32), the first and second pieces of data received from an external source (other PC of fig. 1) over a communication network (Internet, column 4, lines 60-65); on a third thread, (another task of the PC that received the email) applying processing (column 21, lines 19-27) to the first and second pieces of data store in a memory (column 6, lines 20-21) to provide first and second processed pieces of memory data; on a fourth thread (another task of a PC), sending the first and second processed pieces of memory data through a print driver (30, fig. 3, column 9, lines 39-50, column 1, lines 30-40) to a print spooler (column 20, lines 60-67, column 21, lines 1-10) to provide first and second pieces of print-ready data (ready to be sent to the printer); and on a fifth thread (another task of the PC) transferring the first and second pieces of print-ready data through an input/output (the software of the PC that controls data from the printer spooler the printer, column 20, line 67, column 21, line 1) to a printer effective to enable the printer to print the first and second images; wherein the acts of downloading the first piece of data on the first

Art Unit: 2624

thread, , applying processing to the first piece of-memory data on the third thread, sending the first processed of memory data on the fourth-thread, and transferring the first piece of print-ready data on the fifth thread are performed in the given order (please see discussion above).

Okimoto does not teach the received email data file is compressed and decompressed.

Saito, in the same are of sending email files over Internet, (column 3, lines 35-50) teaches to compress the email file and decompressed the file from the receiving computer.

Since it is well known in the art of communication that it is must faster and more economical (by conserving valuable bandwidth of a network) to transmitting data in a compressed form through a network, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Okimoto's computer by: providing a second thread, decompressing the first and second compressed pieces of email data to provided a first and second decompressed data in the memory (inherently, all decompression requires a memory for storing the decompressed data).

Although Okimoto teaches processing the image received, it does not use the word "image processing."

However, Okimoto in column 30 –40 teaches it is well known in the art that to have the PC read in the email to the application and print from the application. Okimoto

also teaches, in column 10 lines 40-45, that the email read into the application would be edited (image processed) by a user.

Furthermore, Maeda in the same area of receiving email, teaches the processing of the email image file using the capability of the receiving computer (i.e., the processing of received email of Okimoto) would be interpreted as image processing by people skill in the field (column 10, lines 28-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Okimoto to include: applied image processing to the received images before printing in order to achieve a satisfactory printed images as desired by the user or processed the image into a printable form (this step is a must in order to print the images if image processing is interpreted the same way as Maeda).

Regarding claim 25: Saito teaches it is well known in the art to send email using compressed raster data (column 3, lines 35-50).

Regarding claim 26: Okimoto teaches wherein the communication network comprises a global Internet (column 5, lines 3-7: note internet inherently is global).

Regarding claim 27: Okimoto teaches wherein the first and the second image each comprises a page of a document (column 10, lines 40-45, Okimoto; also see column 3, lines 35-40 Saito).

Regarding claim 29: Okimoto teaches wherein the acts of downloading the second compressed piece of data on the first thread, decompressing the second compressed piece of data on the second thread, applying image processing to the

second piece of memory data on the third thread, sending the second processed piece of memory data on the fourth thread, and transferring the second piece of print-ready data on the fifth thread are performed in the given order (see discussion of claim 24).

Regarding claim 30: Okimoto teaches the method of claim 24, wherein the act of decompressing the first compressed piece of data on the second thread is performed immediately after completion of downloading of the first compressed piece of data on the first thread (see discussion of claim 24, decompression of an image is impossible to be acted on without first downloads the image; the first compressed image is being regarded as the email being received by the email receiving task ahead of next email (second compressed image data)).

Regarding claim 31: Okimoto teaches the method of claim 24, wherein the act of downloading the first and second compressed pieces of data on the first thread downloads the second compressed piece of data immediately after downloading the first compressed piece of data (the first compressed image is being regarded as the email being received by the email receiving task ahead of next email (second compressed image data)).

6. Claims 35-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okimoto et al (US 6,426,799) in view of Saito (US 6,982,801), Maeda (US 6,775,705), and Kageyama (US 6,025,923).

Regarding claim 35: See discussion of claim 24.

Okimoto does not teach wherein three or more of these acts/threads are performed concurrently for different images.

Kageyama, in the same area of processing tasks by a processor, teaches it is well known in the art process tasks concurrently (fig. 13).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Okimoto to include: wherein three or more of these acts are performed concurrently for different images to speed up processing.

Regarding claim 36: Saito teaches it is well known in the art to send email using compressed raster data (column 3, lines 35-50).

Regarding claim 37: Okimoto teaches wherein the communication network comprises a global Internet (column 5, lines 3-7: note internet inherently is global).

Regarding claim 38: Okimoto teaches wherein the first and the second image each comprises a page of a document (column 10, lines 40-45, Okimoto; also see column 3, lines 35-40 Saito).

7. Claims 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okimoto et al (US 6,426,799) in view of Maeda (US 6,775,705).

Regarding claim 32-34: Okimoto teaches a computer-implemented (column 4, lines 65-67) method comprising: on a first thread, (task of PC, column 4, lines 65-67) downloading first and second pieces of data for first and second images (e.g., the pages of column 10, lines 40-45, fig. 20, of email received, column 14, lines 30-32), the first

and second pieces of data received from an external source (other PC of fig. 1) over a communication network (Internet, column 4, lines 60-65); on a third thread, (another task of the PC that received the email) applying processing (column 21, lines 19-27) to the first and second pieces of data store in a memory (column 6, lines 20-21) to provide first and second processed pieces of memory data; on a fourth thread (another task of a PC), sending the first and second processed pieces of memory data through a print driver (30, fig. 3, column 9, lines 39-50, column 1, lines 30-40) to a print spooler (column 20, lines 60-67, column 21, lines 1-10) to provide first and second pieces of print-ready data (ready to be sent to the printer); and on a fifth thread (another task of the PC) transferring the first and second pieces of print-ready data through an input/output (the software of the PC that controls data from the printer spooler the printer, column 20, line 67, column 21, line 1) to a printer effective to enable the printer to print the first and second images; wherein the acts of downloading the first piece of data on the first thread, applying processing to the first piece of memory data on the third thread, sending the first processed of memory data on the fourth-thread, and transferring the first piece of print-ready data on the fifth thread are performed in the given order (please see discussion above).

Although Okimoto teaches processing the image received, it does not use the word "image processing."

However, Okimoto in column 30 –40 teaches it is well known in the art that to have the PC read in the email to the application and print from the application. Okimoto

Art Unit: 2624

also teaches, in column 10 lines 40-45, that the email read into the application would be edited (image processed) by a user.

Furthermore, Maeda in the same area of receiving email, teaches the processing of the email image file using the capability of the receiving computer (i.e., the processing of received email of Okimoto) would be interpreted as image processing by people skill in the field (column 10, lines 28-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Okimoto to include: applied image processing to the received images before printing in order to achieve a satisfactory printed images as desired by the user or processed the image into a printable form (this step is a must in order to print the images if image processing is interpreted the same way as Maeda).

8. Claims 35-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art and Kageyama (US 6,025,923).

Regarding claim 35-37: Applicant admitted prior art teaches all of the claimed limitations (page 2, lines 18-27, page 1, lines 20-25) except wherein three or more of these acts/threads are performed concurrently for different images.

Kageyama, in the same area of processing tasks by a processor, teaches it is well known in the art process tasks concurrently (fig. 13).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified admitted prior art to include: wherein

three or more of these acts are performed concurrently for different images to speed up processing.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 28, 39 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 24-39 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Please see detailed office action.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to King Y. Poon whose telephone number is 571-272-7440. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00-4:30.

Art Unit: 2624

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached on 571-272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

February 3, 2006


KING Y. POON
PRIMARY EXAMINER